DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 971 RC 005 193

AUTHOR	Oberle, Wayne H.; Kuvlesky, William P.
TITLE	Occupational Role Models of Negro Youth.
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Texas Academy of Science, Nacogdoches, Texas, March 11-13, 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Grade 10, *Identification (Psychological), *Negro Youth, *Occupational Aspiration, Parent Influence, *Rural Urban Differences, *Sex Differences, Socioeconomic Status, Teacher Influence

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to utilize data from 478 East Texas Negro sophomores to determine what extent (nonmetropolitan or metropolitan) residence and sex differences exist in the identity of reference individuals selected by adolescents. Major findings were (1) that place of residence makes less difference in the selection patterns than does sex; (2) that males and nonmetropolitan females select glamour figures more than any other type of reference individual, including parents; (3) that metropolitan males have a more diverse selection pattern than do nonmetropolitan males; (4) that males choose glamour figures substantially more than do females; and (5) that socioeconomic status controls did not alter the selection patterns: (a) place of residence differences by sex on such patterns are similar with or without the controls, and (b) sex differences by place of residence on such patterns are not only similar with or without the controls but make 2 of the patterns more pronounced. Implications of the findings for future research are made. (Author)

ED048971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OCCUPATIONAL ROLE MODELS OF NEGRO YOUTH*

Wayne H. Oberle and William P. Kuvlesky
Texas A&M University

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to utilize data from 478 East Texas Negro sophomores to determine what extent (nonmetropolitan or metropolitan) residence and sex differences exist in the identity of reference individuals selected by adolescents. Major findings were: (1) that place of residence makes less difference in the selection patterns than does sex; (2) that males and nonmetropolitan females select glamour figures more than any other type of reference individual, including parents; (3) that metropolitan males have a more diverse selection pattern than do nonmetropolitan males; (4) that males choose glamour figures substantially more than do females; and (5) socio-economic status controls did not alter the selection patterns: (a) place of residence differences by sex on such patterns are similar with or without the controls; and (b) sex differences by place of residence on such patterns are not only similar with or without the controls but make two of the patterns more pronounced. Implications of the findings for future research are made.

RC005269

*Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Texas Academy of Science, Nacogdoches, Texas, March 11-13, 1971. The research included in this paper was supported by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to research project H-2611 and USDA (CSRS) project S-61, "Human Resource Development and Mobility in the Rural South."

THE PROBLEM

Although it is known that parents have a large part in the continuing interaction between the adolescent and those who seek to influence him (socialization agents), no research has been reported on the extent to which adolescents actually prefer to pattern their life after their parents or other socialization agents (e.g. teachers, friends).[1] The broad objective of this paper is to investigate the identity of role models selected by Negro boys and girls utilizing data from a recent study of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan youth from East Texas.

This objective can be placed in the context of several tasks which must be completed before research results in the area of status projections of adolescents can contribute to a partial theory of the development of human resources.[2] These include: (1) the enumeration of assumptions which have precluded incorporation of these phenomena within a broader structural framework (i.e., social interaction, socialization, social mobility, and social stratification); (2) the development of concepts which not only help identify elements (e.g., the actor's knowledge, goals or values) common to these dimensions but also help distinguish among the actor's thinking, feeling, and interaction; and (3) the testing of propositions involving selected relationships among such elements in the context of the linkage of the self to the larger social context of action. It is at this point that the consideration of role models becomes an important factor.

FRAMEWORK

Assumptions that need explication relative to the problem mentioned

above include (but are not limited to) the following: (1) (Williams, 1965:79) the family system is structured "to require" the emancipation of young people from the family; (2) (Williams, 1965:285) that parents view their children less impersonally than do teachers; (3) (Havighurst and Davis, 1955:441) that middle class parents allow their children more freedom of movement away from home during the day than do lower class parents; (4) (Hollinghead, 1949:149) that the high school is an institution which functions to shield adolescents from knowledge about adult society rather than helping them adjust to it; (5) (Davis, 1940:530) that parental authority "however inclusive is not felt as despotic" by the child; (6) (Nimkoff, 1942:520) that the child's preferences for one parent or for any identifying figure is not static; and (7) (Burchinal, et al., 1962:4) that many youth desiring success lack financial resources, knowledge about society and themselves, and variety and intensity of interaction experiences.

Conceptual precision of ideas linking various structural dimensions of the process of human development is lacking. For instance, note the confusing overlap and lack of clear distinctions among ideas such as reference groups, reference individuals, significant others, and role models. Burchinal, Haller, and Taves (1962:8) state that an individual's reference groups are the "groups with whom he identifies and usually associates, the groups from whom he derives ideas about himself, his values, people, things, job preferences, etc." They also mention that "'important others' include parents, relatives, school personnel, friends, and perhaps some adult whom the youth takes as a model for his own life." Such conceptualization -- that one individual's identification with another individual can be very inclusive -- differs from that of Shibutani

(1955:563). He indicates three distinct referents for the concept reference group: (1) "groups which serve as comparison points; (2) groups to which men aspire; and (3) groups whose perspectives are assumed by the actor." Thus, he does not mention reference individuals.

Although there is some recognition of the need for the distinction between reference individuals and groups, there is less agreement on the distinction itself. Merton (1957:284) recognized that the concept 'reference group' is something of a misnomer: "For the term is applied not only to groups, but to individuals and to social categories as well." He (Merton, 1957:302) also stated that "research and theory have tended to focus on reference groups to the relative neglect of reference individuals." Sewell, Haller, and Portes (1969:84-85) also acknowledge the need for the distinction but prefer a different concept. They suggest that the concept "significant others" is more appropriate than that of "reference group" because "it eliminates the implication that collectivities such as one's friends, or work groups, or parents are necessarily the influential agents for all individuals." They cite (1969:84) Woelfel's (1967) definition of significant others: "the specific persons from whom the individual obtains his level of aspiration, either because they serve as models or because they communicate to him their expectations for his behavior."

Kemper's (1968:32-34) conceptualization of reference, normative, and comparison groups not only improves Woelfel's definition but also provides a framework within which the common misuse of the concept role model may be constructively modified. More specifically he differentiates comparison groups from reference and normative groups on the basis of function: "Comparison groups...provide the actor with a frame of reference which serves to facilitate

judgments about any of several problematic issues." He then specifies role model to be a type of "comparison group which influences the actor's judgment about the adequacy of his performance: 'Usually an individual rather than a group, and possibly a fictional or historical figure....'"

Kemper (1968:34) posits that there is probable empirical overlap among different reference group functions: they probably "often do reside in the same group or individual locus, e.g., a parent can be a normative figure, a comparison figure, and an audience to a child." Nevertheless, research directed toward the measurement of such functional overlap will likely be best advanced through careful adherence to the following conceptual distinction between a reference individual and a role model (Merton, 1957:302-303):

> The person who identifies himself with a reference individual will seek to approximate the behavior and values of that individual in his several roles. The concept of role model can be thought of as more restricted in scope, denoting a more limited identification with an individual in only one or a selected few of his roles. To be sure, a role model may become a reference individual as his multiple roles are adopted for emulation rather than emulation remaining confined to the one role on the basis of which the initial psychological relationship was established.[3]

Essentially then, the concept of role model and reference individual represent the same generic idea but have different empirical referents. Role model has as its referent relatively specific and limited roles or role sets, whereas reference individual refers to generalized roles of a more inclusive nature (e.g. middle class adult). In terms of this conceptual distinction we will be concerned in this effort with only the concept of reference individual.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the research literature illustrates that the scope of many studies has been limited to the measurement of the influence of one or two reference groups (e.g. television, parents, teachers, or peers) on such factors

as occupational role knowledge, educational aspirations, plans to farm.[4] Nevertheless, the following empirically-based points, taken collectively, seem suggestive: (1) (Haller, 1960) that the parents of farm-reared boys are deviant if they want the boy to be (upwardly) mobile; (2) that if the boy develops a self-conception of non-farmer he will use information available in the area to develop the higher levels of aspiration needed for successfully entering urban work; if his self-conception remains that of farmer he will tend not to utilize the information; (3) (Straus, 1969) that urban-ness and middle class status are associated with greater kinship interaction than are rural-ness and working class status; (4) (Balan, 1968) that although a farm background is not in itself a handicap, community of origin -- the place where the individual spent most of his life between the ages of 5 and 15 -- is an important determinant of the socio-economic position an individual has "in the urban stratification system"; (5) (Straus, 1963) that farmers' sons, by virtue of their early self-concept as farmer-to-be and parental encouragement in this respect, "prematurely terminate the occupational decision process, and do not perceive and make use of the available sources of occupational information."

Resultant propositions include: (1) the adolescent's adjustment to the urban-industrial world of work varies directly with his perception of his self, which may be objectively unrealistic; (2) the individual's judgment of how realistic his self-conception is varies directly with the variety and intensity of his orientation to various normative, comparison, and audience groups or individuals; (3) the variety of his exposure to these three types of reference groups or individuals varies directly with (a) the size of the

community of origin, (b) socio-economic status (education and occupation of his parents), and (c) age. Our analysis should provide some empirical evidence relative to proposition (3).

We found three studies that attempted to examine the complex relationship between reference groups or individuals on the one hand and types of status projections on the other. Uzzell (1961) sought to determine the influence of occupational role models (persons in the field to which they aspired) on the occupational aspirations of Negro male urban high school seniors. Of the seventy percent who knew occupational role models, three-fourths indicated that they were influenced by them. Perhaps the most significant finding was that teacher was the occupation most aspired to and that all of the respondents selecting this occupation indicated knowing a personal model. Riccio (1965) found that the role models of migrant adolescents from the Appalachian South whose parents settled in a lower-middle class suburb of a large city did not differ significantly from those of non-Appalachians in the same suburb. The open-ended question used to elicit information about the role models was "Which people in this world would you most want to be like?" Thus, whereas Uzzell's study was concerned with occupational role models, Riccio's was focusing on reference individuals.

Research by Drabick (1967) focused on reference groups affecting educational and occupational expectations of high school seniors. He asked each respondent to indicate what he believed to have been the major source of influence upon his decision to participate in the occupation which he expected to attain upon completion of his education. Important findings were: (1) that the mother is the major outside-of-self source of influence; (2) that teachers

exert the next single greatest external influence, followed by friends; (3) that parents, combined, are a major external source of influence; (4) that a significantly greater proportion of Negro than white students perceived an influence by their mothers, their teachers, and themselves, while a smaller proportion considered as influential their fathers, friends, and others; (5) that males, significantly more than females, considered their fathers and brothers as greater sources of influence than were their mothers and sisters; the situation was exactly the opposite for females; (6) that there were no relationships between residence and perceived source of influence upon occupational expectation; however, the categories were town, village, rural nonfarm, and farm -- there was no metropolitan category; (7) that one explanation for the finding that significantly more Negro than white students believed their occupational choices to have been their own "would be that the Negro student believed himself to have fewer competent sources of information to which he could turn"; and (8) that similar findings were obtained with reference to perceived sources of influence on educational expectations.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The analysis to be reported here is structured in terms of the following specific research objectives:

(1) To determine the extent to which place of residences differences occur in the identity of reference individuals for Negro youth.

(2) To determine the extent to which sex differences occur in identity of reference individuals for Negro youth.

(3) To determine to what extent socio-economic status (SES) accounts for differences in (1) above.

RESEARCH OPERATIONS

Selection of Respondents

The procedures used in selection of the study population, to be discussed in detail below, provided respondents representing extreme polar positions in rural-urban variations of communities in reference to location, size of place, and density. Bealer and his associates recently evaluated the significance of these on other aspects of the rural-urban distinction (Bealer, et.al, 1965).

We interviewed all high school sophomores attending school in three all rural, nonmetropolitan counties of East Texas. In addition to rurality, these counties were purposefully selected to provide study units composed of a disproportionately large number of Negroes and poor families. These rural counties are characterized by social structures and values indicative of the "traditional South"[5]. The sophomore classes of the 13 all-Negro schools involved ranged from 5 to 30 students. The urban respondents consisted of a 50% sample of sophomore homerooms in a large all-Negro high school located in a low-income ward of Houston.

A questionnaire requiring from 35 minutes to an hour to complete was group administered in each school contacted during the Spring of 1966. The respondents were assured of anonymity before starting on the questionnaire. No attempt was made to contact students enrolled in school but not present the day of the interview (8%) or persons of similar age but not enrolled in school. The composition of the study population by residence type and sex is described in Table 1.

Instruments and Measures

The two basic comparative variables, place of residence and sex, were self-indicated by respondents through simple check-off items and checked for validity against school records. Two additional variables are involved in the projected analysis: identification of reference individual and socio-economic status.

The dependent variable for this analysis is type of reference individual. The indicator used for this variable was response to a forced-choice question that asked the respondent to "Think of the person whom you would most want to fashion your life after". The nine alternative response categories covered a wide range of sources -- family, school, community, and mass media -- and are listed as follows:

1 A teacher or school counselor
2 Your father or mother
3 An older brother or sister
4 A relative not in your immediate family
5 A close friend, not related to you
6 A movie or TV star
7 A famous athlete
8 An important government official
9 Other (Who?_____)

For purpose of analysis the original categories of "movie or TV star", "famous athlete", and "government official" were collapsed into a more inclusive category representing "glamour" figures (See Table A, Appendix). In addition, a number of responses originally marked by the respondent as other were reclassified into other alternatives, particularly the "glamour" and a new analytical category, "non-glamour, professional and technical".

The need for an SES indicator evolved out of our desire to determine whether or not any residence differences observed were determined by the

disproportionate lower class status of Negroes among the rural population. Because of the small number of respondents and the disproportionate classification of Negroes as lower class (Obordo, 1968) the only reasonable attempt to control on SES was to compare the lower class segments of both residence groupings. We used responses to an open-end question asking for the main job of the main breadwinner for our indicator of SES. These responses were originally classified in terms of a modified Alba Edwards Census scheme. From this original classification, those coded as unemployed, laborers (including farm), operatives (including enlisted men), and housewives[6] were grouped together as Lower Class.

Design for Analysis

The analysis consists of two parts. The first section is a cross-classification of reference individual alternatives by place of residence and sex for the total study population. The second part is a parallel analysis utilizing only the Lower Class segments structured to ascertain the influence of SES on place of residence differences (if any).

Chi square tests were used to estimate the statistical significance of observed differences.

RESULTS

Place of residence differences in the selection of reference individuals were generally minor (Table 2): metropolitan and nonmetropolitan profiles were basically similar for boys and for girls. Secondary patterns contributing to the statistical significance of metropolitan-nonmetropolitan differences and worthy of note were:

(A) Those that are not sex-linked:

(1) Metropolitan youth select a greater variety of reference individuals than do nonmetropolitan youth.

(2) Metropolitan youth choose friends more often than do nonmetropolitan youth.

(3) Metropolitan youth choose non-glamour reference individuals more often than do nonmetropolitan youth.

(4) Nonmetropolitan youth select glamour figures more often than do metropolitan youth.

(B) Those that are sex-linked:

(1) Although place of residence differences in the selection of reference individuals are generally small, minor inter-profile variations per category are more common for males than for females. Place of residence variations of 5 percent or more existed for 4 of the 7 male profile categories.

(2) Metropolitan males select both relatives and friends substantially more often than do nonmetropolitan males.

(3) Nonmetropolitan males select parents more often than do metropolitan males.

Sex differences in the dependent variable are common and occur independently of place of residence (Table 3), indicating that sex is more important than place of residence in producing differences in the dependent variable. Notable patterns contributing to the high level of statistical significance were:

(C) Those that are not linked to place of residence:

(1) Males select glamour figures more often than females.

(2) Females select teachers more often than do males.

(3) Females choose relatives slightly more often than do males.

(4) Females select friends slightly more often than do males.

(D) Those that are linked to place of residence:

(1) The following selection patterns resulted (1 = most common):

Type of Reference Individual	Metropolitan		Nonmetropolitan	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Teachers	5	1	4	2
Parents	2	4	2	4
Siblings	6	6	3	5
Relatives	4	2	5	3
Friends	3	2	6	6
Glamour	1	5	1	1
Non-glamour	7	7	7	7

(2) Metropolitan males choose glamour figures substantially more often than metropolitan females.

(3) Metropolitan females select teachers substantially more often than metropolitan males.

(4) Nonmetropolitan males choose parents slightly more often than nonmetropolitan females.

(5) Nonmetropolitan males select siblings slightly more often than do nonmetropolitan females.

Going beyond the differences observed as a result of our comparative analyses on residence and sex, a number of more general observations that hold regardless of sex and place of residence are reported as follows:

(1) The more often glamour figures are selected, the more often parents are selected.

(2) The more often glamour figures are selected, the less often relatives and friends are selected.

(3) The more often glamour figures are selected, the less often teachers are selected.

(4) The more often relatives are selected, the more often friends are selected.

An observation that held for place of residence differences but not for sex differences was:

(5) The more often parents are selected, the more often siblings are selected.

SES Control

Place of residence differences in the dependent variable are essentially unaltered by SES controls (Table B, Appendix). A comparison of these differences in the total population and in the lower class respondents shows only two shifts -- decreases -- in the magnitude of between 5 and 10 percent per category of metropolitan-nonmetropolitan differences (Table 4):

(aa) that nonmetropolitan males select parents more often than do metropolitan males was reduced from an 8 percent difference to a 3 percent difference.

(bb) that nonmetropolitan females choose glamour figures more often than do metropolitan females was reduced from a 10 percent difference to an 8 percent difference.

Sex differences in the dependent variable are also basically unaltered by SES controls (Table C, Appendix). A comparison of these differences in the total population and in the lower class respondents shows four shifts -- three increases and one decrease -- in the categorical magnitude of sex differences (Table 5):

(a) that males choose parents as reference individuals slightly more often than do females was increased from a negative 1 percent difference to a 5 percent difference.

(b) that males select siblings more often than do females was raised from a 3 percent difference to a 5 percent difference.

(c) that females choose relatives (not in immediate family) slightly more often than do males, particularly nonmetropolitan males was increased from an 8 percent difference to a 10 percent difference.

(d) that females select friends slightly more often than do males was reduced from a 7 percent difference to a 4 percent difference.

In brief, these minor changes per reference individual category included three increases and a decrease: patterns (a) and (c) were more pronounced with the SES control, pattern (b) emerged, and pattern (d) was less pronounced.

The results of SES controls on place of residence and sex differences, then, indicate no pattern reversals. Sex, regardless of SES controls, makes a substantial difference in the dependent variable.

DISCUSSION

The broad objective of this paper was to investigate the identity of role models selected by metropolitan and nonmetropolitan youth from East Texas. In this effort we were concerned with only the reference individual -- a model for a very broad and inclusive role (Merton, 1957:302-303). Furthermore, the forced-choice question used to elicit information was future-oriented and had reference to a generalized role of a fairly inclusive nature: "think of the person whom you would most want to fashion your life after."

The finding that place of residence makes minor differences in the dependent variable is contrary to many findings of status projection research. It is consistent with Drabick's (1967) finding that there were no relationships between residence and perceived source of influence upon occupational expectation. It is also supportive of Riccio's (1965) finding that community of origin did not make a difference in reference individuals selected by adolescents from the Appalachian South. Furthermore, our finding that nonmetropolitan youth select family members as reference individuals more often than do metropolitan youth seems inconsistent with Straus' (1969) finding that urban-ness is related to greater kinship interaction than rural-ness.

The finding that sex does make a substantial difference in the dependent variable indicates the necessity of future research including a control for sex. Findings that males select glamour figures more often and teachers less often than do females when coupled with Uzzell's (1961) finding that teacher was the occupation most aspired to, suggest a proposition: since many, if not most, teachers in Negro schools are Negro females, and since (following Drabick, 1967) source of influence perceived by high school seniors

is sex-linked, and since many, if not most of the youth in this study do not interact frequently with middle-class family members (including relatives) or friends, then if they want to experience upward mobility, males will select glamour figures and females will select glamour figures or teachers. This proposition derived from our findings needs to be examined in future research involving either selection of reference individuals and/or status projections.

What minor differences place of residence produced in the dependent variable were further reduced by SES controls. This suggests that there may not be any research utility in the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan distinction for future research efforts. Of course, this proposition will have to be verified in future research dealing with other kinds of study populations (e.g. other regions and other ethnic groups).

Table 1. Classification of the East Texas Respondents by Residence and Sex.

	Metropolitan	Nonmetropolitan
	N	
Male	111	98
Female	170	99
TOTAL	281	197

Table 2. Identity of Reference Individuals of Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Texas Negro Sophomores by Sex: 1966.

Types of Reference Individuals	Male[a] Metropolitan N=105	Male[a] Nonmetropolitan N=94	Female[b] Metropolitan N=157	Female[b] Nonmetropolitan N=97
	percent			
Teacher or school counselor	10	9	22	22
Father or mother	17	25	18	19
Older brother or sister	8	10	5	7
Relative not in immediate family	11	4	19	20
Close friend, not relative	12	2	19	6
Glamour	38	49	15	25
Non-glamour[c]	4	1	2	1
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
No information	2	4	5	0

[a] $X^2 = 13.32$ df = 5 $.02 < P < .05$

[b] $X^2 = 11.46$ df = 5 $.02 < P < .05$

[c] Not included in chi-square analysis

Table 3. Identity of Reference Individuals of Male and Female Texas Negro Sophomores by Residence Type: 1966

Types of Reference Individuals	Metropolitan[a] Male N=105	Metropolitan[a] Female N=157	Nonmetropolitan[b] Male N=94	Nonmetropolitan[b] Female N=97
	percent			
Teacher or school counselor	10	22	9	22
Father or mother	17	18	25	19
Older brother or sister	8	5	10	7
Relative not in immediate family	11	19	4	20
Close friend, not related	12	19	2	6
Glamour	38	15	49	25
Non-glamour[c]	4	2	1	1
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
No Information	2	5	4	0

[a] $X^2 = 25.15$ df = 5 $P < .001$

[b] $X^2 = 24.90$ df = 5 $P < .001$

[c] Not included in chi-square analysis

Table 5. Summary of Sex Differences in the Identity of Reference Individuals of the Total Population and Lower Class of Texas Negro Sophomores by Residence Type: 1966.

	Teachers		Parents		Siblings		Relatives		Friends		Glamour	
	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.
	Percent											
A. Metropolitan												
Male	10	10	17	21*	8	8*	11	10	12	13	38**	37**
Female	22**	23**	18	16	5	3	19*	20**	19*	17	15	19
B. Nonmetropolitan												
Male	9	11	25*	24*	10	6	4	3	2	2	49**	52**
Female	22**	22**	19	18	7	7	20**	22**	6	3	25	27

* Male-female differences for this reference individual category by residence type are between 5 and 10 percent.

** Male-female differences for this reference individual category by residence type are at least 10 percent.

Table 4. Summary of Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Differences in the Identity of Reference Individuals of the Total Population and Lower Class of Texas Negro Sophomores by Sex: 1966.

	Teachers		Parents		Siblings		Relatives		Friends		Glamour	
	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.	Total	L.C.
	Percent											
A. Males												
Metropolitan	10	10	17	21	8	8	11*	10*	12**	13**	38	37
Nonmetropolitan	9	11	25*	24	10	6	4	3	2	2	49**	52**
B. Females												
Metropolitan	22	23	18	16	5	3	19	20	19**	17**	15	19
Nonmetropolitan	22	22	19	18	7	7	20	22	6	3	25**	27*

* Metropolitan-nonmetropolitan differences for this reference individual category by sex are between 5 and 10 percent.

** Metropolitan-nonmetropolitan differences for this reference individual category are at least 10 percent.

APPENDIX

Table A. Identity of Reference Individuals of East Texas Negro Sophomores - 1966: Place of Residence Differences by Sex.

Types of Reference Individuals	Male				Female			
	Metropolitan		Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan		Nonmetropolitan	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher or school counselor	10	9.2	8	8.5	35	21.1	21	21.1
Father or mother	18	16.5	24	25.5	28	17.0	18	18.6
Older brother or sister	8	7.3	9	9.6	8	4.9	7	7.0
Relative not in immediate family	12	11.0	4	4.3	30	18.2	19	19.1
Close friend, not related	13	11.9	2	2.1	30	18.2	6	6.1
Glamour:[a]								
Movie or TV star	1	.9	5	5.3	9	5.5	12	12.1
Famous athlete	27	24.8	33	35.1	2	1.2	2	2.0
Important government official	12	11.0	8	8.5	12	7.3	11	11.1
Non-glamour[b]	4	3.7	1	1.1	3	1.8	1	1.0
Other:								
Self	1	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No One	2	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8	0	0.0
Others	1	.9	0	0.0	5	3.0	2	1.9
Total	109	100.0	94	100.0	165	100.0	99	100.0
No Information 11	2		4		5		0	

[a] Theoretically, entry into any of these occupations would be very difficult -- rare skills or abilities would be required.
[b] This category included doctors, nurses, vetinarians, decorators, lawyers, scientists, secret agents, reform workers, dieticians and ministers.

APPENDIX

Table B. Identity of Reference Individuals of Lower Class Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Respondents By Sex - 1966.

Type of Reference Individuals	Male[a]				Female[b]			
	Metropolitan		Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan		Nonmetropolitan	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher or school counselor	6	9.7	7	11.1	22	23.3	15	22.0
Father or mother	13	21.0	15	23.8	15	16.0	12	17.7
Older brother or sister	5	8.1	4	6.4	3	3.2	5	7.4
Relative not in immediate family	6	9.7	2	3.2	19	20.2	15	22.0
Close friend, not related	8	12.9	1	1.6	16	17.0	2	2.9
Glamour	23	37.0	33	52.3	18	19.2	18	26.5
Non-glamour[c]	1	1.6	1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1.5
Total	62	100.0	63	100.0	94	100.0	68	100.0
No Information	1		2		5		1	

[a] $X^2 = 9.57$ df = 5 $.05 < P < .10$

[b] $X^2 = 9.54$ df = 5 $.05 < P < .10$

[c] not included in chi-square analysis

APPENDIX

Table C. Identity of Reference Individuals of Lower Class Male and Female Respondents by Place of Residence - 1966.

Types of Reference Individuals	Metropolitan[a] Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Nonmetropolitan[b] Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %
Teacher or school counselor	6	9.7	22	23.3	7	11.1	15	22.0
Father or mother	13	21.0	15	16.0	15	23.8	12	17.7
Older brother or sister	5	8.1	3	3.2	4	6.4	5	7.4
Relative not in immediate family	6	9.7	19	20.2	2	3.2	15	22.0
Close friend, not related	8	12.9	16	17.0	1	1.6	2	2.9
Glamour	23	37.0	18	19.2	33	52.3	18	26.5
Non-glamour[c]	1	1.6	1	1.1	1	1.6	1	1.5
Total	62	100.0	94	100.0	63	100.0	68	100.0
No Information 6	1		5		2		1	

[a] $X^2 = 13.78$ df = 5 $.01 < P < .05$

[b] $X^2 = 17.86$ df = 5 $.001 < P < .01$

[c] not included in chi-square analysis

FOOTNOTES

1. Socialization may be defined as a process of social interaction in which the individual acquires those ways of thinking (perceptual set), feeling (emotional set), and acting (behavioral set) essential for effective participation in society. Although this paper refers to data at one point in time, (1966), a forthcoming paper (Oberle and Kuvlesky, 1970 b) reports data on the same(and an additional [White])sample at a subsequent (two years) point in time(1968).

2. Following (Warner, 1968:1), human development is an increase in the opportunity for people to attain desired goals.

3. For a review of the concept role and its defferent referents, see Pugh (1966:836).

4. See, respectively, DeFleur (1967), and Kandel and Lesser (1969), and Haller (1960).

5. This is evidenced in the fact that at the time of the interviews (1966) only one of the 23 schools involved in the study had experienced more than "token" integration and 13 of these were all-Negro schools.

6. Since lower class st tus was based on the job of the main breadwinner and since the head of household often is a female providing family subsistence from welfare and/or insurance, we made a judgment decision to include this category.

REFERENCES

Balan, Jorge
1968 "Are Farmers' Sons Handicapped in the City?" Rural Sociology 33 (June): 160-174.

Bealer, Robert C., Fern K. Willits, and William P. Kuvlesky
1965 "The Meaning of 'Rurality' in American Society," Rural Sociology 30 (September): 255-266.

Burchinal, Lee G., Archibald O. Haller, and Marvin J. Taves
1962 "Career Choice of Rural Youth in a Changing Society," Minneapolis: Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 458, University of Minnesota. North Central Regional Publication No. 142.

Clausen, John A. (ed.)
1968 Socialization and Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Cosby, Arthur
1969 "The Disadvantaged Student, Goal-Blockage, and the Occupational Aspirations of Southern Youth," paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Mobile, Alabama.

Davis, Kingsley
1940 "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict." American Sociological Review 5 (August): 523-535.

Drabick, Lawrence W.
1967 "Perceived Sources of Influence Upon Occupational and Educational Expectations," Raleigh: Agricultural Experiment Station, Progress Report Soc. (formerly R.S.) 50, North Carolina State University.

Haller, Archibald O.
1960 "The Occupational Achievement Progress of Farm-Reared Youth in Urban-Industrial Society," Rural Sociology 25 (September): 321-333.

Haller, Archibald O. and Irwin W. Miller
1963 "The Occupational-Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure, and Correlates," East Lansing: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan State University, Technical Bulletin 288.

Havighurst and Davis
1955 "A Comparison of the Chicago and Harvard Studies of Social Class Differences in Child Rearing," American Sociological Review 20 (August): 438-442.

Hollinghead, August B.
1949 Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kemper, Theodore D.
1968 "Reference Groups, Socialization, and Achievement," American Sociological Review 33 (February): 31-45.

Merton, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Nimkoff, Meyer F.
1942 "The Child's Preference for Father or Mother," American Sociological Refiew 7 (August): 517-524.

Oberle, Wayne H. and Rex R. Campbell
1971 "What is an Occupational Choice?" Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Jacksonville, Florida, February.

Oberle, Wayne H. and William P. Kuvlesky
1971b "Occupational Role Models of Black and White Youth at Two Stages of Adolescence," paper to be presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, Texas, March, 1971.

Obordo, Angelita S.
1968 "Status Orientations Toward Family Development," unpublished Master of Science Thesis, Texas A&M University, January, 1968.

Pugh, Derek
1966 "Role Activation Conflict: A Study of Industrial Inspection," American Sociological Review 31 (December): 835-842.

Riccio, Anthony
1965 "Occupational Aspirations of Migrant Adolescents from the Appalachian South," Vocational Guidance Quarterly 14 (Autumn): 26-30.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes
1969 "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process," American Sociological Review 34 (February): 82-92.

Shibutani, Tamotsu
1955 "Reference Groups as Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology 60 (May): 562-569.

Straus, Murry A.
1964 "Societal Needs and Personal Characteristics in the Choice of Farm, Blue Collar, and White Collar Occupations by Farmers' Sons," Rural Sociology 29 (December): 408-425.

Uzell, Odell
1961 "Influencers of Occupational Choices," Personnel and Guidance Journal 39 (April): 666-669.

Warner, W. Keith
1968 "The Structural Matrix of Development," paper presented at the Conference on the Sociology of Development, Ames, Iowa, March.

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
1965 American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Woelfel, Joseph
1967 "Paradigm for Research on Significant Others," presented at joint meetings of the American Sociological Association and the Society for the Prevention of Social Problems, San Francisco, California.